



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/001,643	12/31/1997	RUSS L. ALBERT	1431/USW0391	6919

20350 7590 01/10/2006

TOWNSEND AND TOWNSEND AND CREW, LLP
TWO EMBARCADERO CENTER
EIGHTH FLOOR
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111-3834

EXAMINER

HUYNH, CONG LAC T

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2178

DATE MAILED: 01/10/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/001,643	Applicant(s) ALBERT ET AL.	
	Examiner Cong-Lac Huynh	Art Unit 2178	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 October 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to communications: appeal brief filed on 10/26/05 to the application filed on 12/31/97.
2. Claims 1-12 are pending in the case. Claims 1 and 8 are independent claims.
3. The rejections of claims 1-4, 6-11 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Anand in view of Jagadish have been withdrawn in view of Applicants' arguments.
4. The rejections of claims 5, 12 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Anand in view of Jagadish, and further in view of Melchione have been withdrawn in view of Applicants' arguments.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

6. Claims 1-3, 6, 8-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Mansey et al. (US Pat No. 6,023,499, 2/8/00, filed 11/26/97).

Regarding independent claim 1, Mansey discloses:

- a host site connected to at least one computer terminal via an on-line interconnection, said host site comprising a database for storing the user billing and inventory information, and a processor terminal connected to the on-line interconnection for receiving a user report request and sending reports created in response to the received requests and additional on-line user input (figure 1)
- said processor terminal comprises:
 - o a view manager arranged to generate a set of function commands which can be selectively launched by user input to graphically display a list of available views each of which contains a report relating to particular user information stored in a database, create a new view and report, and edit a view and report (col 5, line 36 to col 6, line 46)
 - o a data manager arranged to relate data maintained independently from the host site on a user terminal with the user's billing and inventory data for display as part of a request report, wherein at least a portion of the data maintained independently from the host computer site is displayed as part of the requested report (col 5, lines 55-67, col 6, lines 5-37: the dollar limit for the conference call, provided by the host caller at a user terminal and maintained by the caller independently from the billing system, is used for monitoring and calculating the total charge that will be displayed on the bill statement of the host caller; since the total charge included in the bill statement of the host caller is the same or almost the same as the dollar limit provided by the host caller, the dollar limit is considered the same as

the total charge and is displayed as part of the bill, which is a form of a report to a customer)

Regarding claim 2, which is dependent on claim 1, Mansey discloses that the view editor is arranged to receive and implement user report editing instructions (figure 1, col 3, line 55 to col 4, line 34, col 5, line 7 to col 6, line 37).

Regarding claim 3, the system of Mansey discloses a graphical user interface for the user to interact with the system (figure 1).

Regarding claim 6, which is dependent on claim 1, the system of Mansey discloses an Internet connection and web browser (figure 1).

Claims 8-10 are the method for generating an on-line report performed on the system of claims 1-3, and are rejected under the same rationale.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

9. Claims 4, 7, and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mansey as applied to claims 1 and 3 above, and further in view of Anand et al. (US Pat No. 5,930,764, 7/27/99).

Regarding claim 4, which is dependent on claim 3, Mansey does not disclose a plurality of editing commands comprise a drill down command, a grouping command, a sort command, and a total amount command.

Anand discloses editing commands comprise a drill down command, a grouping command, a sort command, and a total amount command for generating a report (col 17, lines 65-67; col 18, lines 1-50: the aggregating method such as add, average, min, max, count to disclose the change in the Smart Report; col 9, lines 16-32, col 10, lines 50-67: the drill down command).

Art Unit: 2178

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have combined Anand into Mansey since Anand teaches the specific commands for editing a report providing the advantage to include into Mansey for effectively customizing the billing statement upon a particular format request.

Regarding claim 7, which is dependent on claim 1, Mansey discloses the billing process is applied on the Internet via the web browser. However, Mansey does not disclose explicitly that the graphical interface comprises Java applets and an HTML page. Anand discloses that the graphical interface comprises Java applets and an HTML page (col 9, lines 16-57).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have combined Anand into Mansey since using Java applets and HTML pages in such a graphical interface would provide an effectiveness on the on-line billing process.

Claim 11 is the method for generating an on-line report performed on the system of claim 4, and is rejected under the same rationale.

10. Claims 5, 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mansey as applied to claims 1 and 8 above, and further in view of Melchione et al. (US Pat No. 5,930,764, 7/27/99).

Art Unit: 2178

Regarding claim 5, which is dependent on claim 1, Mansey does not disclose that the report filter is arranged to receive user define value for use as threshold value to selectively control which database information will be included in a report.

Melchione discloses the three-tier-hierarchy provides the "key" at each of the household, customer, and customer levels that satisfy user criteria for queries, views, and reports (col 16, lines 45-64).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have combined Melchione into Mansey because Melchione teaches the criteria as a threshold to select which data from the database to be included in the report providing the advantage to quickly selecting the needed data from the database based on the criteria to apply to the billing report in Mansey instead of taking time searching the whole database.

Claim 12 is the method to be performed on the system of claim 5, and therefore rejected under the same rationale.

Conclusion

11. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Bruno et al. (US Pat No. 5,991,380, 11/23/99, filed 10/21/97).

Crosskey et al. (US Pat No. 6,035,281, 3/7/00, filed 6/16/97).

Rainey et al. (US Pat No. 6,205,210, 3/20/01, filed 11/4/96).

Leta et al. (US Pat No. 5,943,406, 8/24/99, filed 9/30/97).

Peschel et al. (US Pat No. 6,385,444, 5/7/02, filed 10/14/97).

12. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Cong-Lac Huynh whose telephone number is 571-272-4125. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri (8:30-6:00).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stephen Hong can be reached on 571-272-4124. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Clh

1/5/06

STEPHEN HONG
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER